DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 750 CS 502 131

AUTHOR Edwards, William H.
TITLE Levels of Knowledge of Public Speaking Principles: An Assessment of Folk Speech Theory.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 25-29, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; College Students; Higher Education; *Knowledge Level; *Persuasive Discourse; *Predictor Variables; *Public Speaking; *Speech Communication; Speech Curriculum; *Student Attitudes; Student Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research

ABSTRACT

The key question underlying this study was: What does the untrained population know about public speaking? The study thus focused on resolving the conflict between folk speech theory, or knowledge that students gain informally, and formal academic speech theory. An Inventory of Public Speaking Principles was devised to test six hypotheses which predict a relationship between a person's educational level, sex, prior speech experience, prior speech training, and that person's attitude toward studying speech communication. One hundred fifty-one students from nine classes in basic speech communication participated in the study by completing the inventory on the first day of classes. Students came to classes with prior and accurate knowledge of public speaking principles, most without benefit of previous training or experience. Analysis of the data indicated strong support for a folk theory of public speaking; in addition, the study provided data for establishing norms regarding what students believe to be acceptable principles of public speaking. (The Inventory of Public Speaking Principles used in the study is appended.) (MAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155750

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC SPEAKING PRINCIPLES
AN ASSESSMENT OF FOLK SPEECH THEORY

A Paper presented by

William H. Edwards
Department of Speech
Columbus College
Columbus, Georgia 31907

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William H. Edwards

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

at the

International Communication Association Conference

Chicago

25 through 29 April 1978

CS 502 13

ABSTRACT

Title: Levels of Knowledge of Public Speaking Principles: An Assessment of Folk Speech Theory.

This paper discusses the thesis that "folk knowledge" runs counter to and endangers what is called "academic knowledge of speech communication." Six hypothesis are analyzed: Level of knowledge of public speaking principles in an untrained population, and the relationship between that level of knowledge and class standing, sex, prior speech experience, prior speech training, and attitude towards studying speech communication. Strong support is given to the idea that there is a folk theory of public speaking. A secondary purpose of the presentation is to present data which can and is used in establishing norms for what students believe to be acceptable principles of public speaking.

William H. Edwards, Department of Speech, Columbus College, Columbus, Georgia.

Public speaking is an integral part of American culture. Without taking a course in public speaking, most Americans from high school age on up have well-formed attitudes and values about public speaking. For example, R. H. Bruskin Associates reported in a national survey of adults that forty percent of Americans have some fear of speaking before groups (Spectra, December 1973). Further, Americans can tell you who is a good speaker, make a fair judgment as to their own abilities, and state some rules of effective speaking. It is true that many of these rules are ambiguous, naive, truistic, and out-of-fashion. Speech performances are too often embarrassing and boring. That Americans have information about public performance theory and have a wide range of experience is hardly surprising. Speech is a critical element of our culture, and public speaking is an essential element of a democratic society (Smith, 1965).

The question I am asking in this paper is: What does the untrained population know about public speaking? I can recall experiences from my basic communication classes, as well as from non-college groups, where individuals would innocently state a principle of public speaking which I disagreed with and which I think most academic communication teachers would disagree with: "You should always stand up while giving a speech," or "He's a good speaker, (because) he doesn't use notes," or "He doesn't have the right to say that--does he think he is an expert or something?" Other

times I have been quite satisfied to hear untrained individuals correctly using concepts like vocal projection, feedback, delivery, audience analysis, organization, credibility, eye-contact, and even evidence and proof. There are some concepts about which students come to class with good knowledge, there are many other concepts that the students are generally ignorant about, other where considerable re-education is required, and still other concepts which are difficult to learn without professional instruction.

Students come to speech communication classes thinking that they already know something about the subject. Many students do not desire to study speech communication because they think they already have a satisfactory understanding of public speaking principles. This attitude is well-illustrated in a conversation I had with a student during the time I was completing work on this project. This student, who was outstanding both in campus life and in the classroom, came to me to take an exemption examination for the public speaking course. We offer the exemption option for students with some prior training and/or experience in public speaking. He had given a large number of speeches, but had no course work. For his written examination I gave him the inventory which was used for the present study. After taking the examination, this student confessed that he had thought he knew a lot about speech before taking the exam, but he now realized he needed to take a course. He did and being the outstanding student he was, he made an "A." It is not what people know about public speaking, but it is what they misunderstand, what they fail to realize, as well as what they do not know which frequently causes problems.

I call this informal level of knowledge which the student brings to class folk knowledge. Folk knowledge is the type information you learn

as you are growing up and becoming socialized. Its principle characteristic is that it is non-systematically taught and learned, and seems to require little effort to learn, although many concepts of folk knowledge require years repetition before the concept is learned. Folk knowledge does not survive from one generation to the next unless the new generation perceives a value for remembering the information. Most categories of academic study can be traced back to folk knowledge: "Folk psychology" prior to psychology; "folk traditions and story" became history; "folk medicine" including everything from witchdoctors to home remedies to faith healing lead to the establishment of medicine and surgery; "folk wisdom" in the form of proverbs, tales, fables, and adages still haunt philosophers; the "oral tradition" lead to the study of communication; and, alchemy became chemistry. The non-systematic nature of folk education lead to the establishment of the more institutionalized form of education. But still the foundation of education is the folk tradition of knowledge, and this tradition has an unyielding influence. And any form of education which does not contribute valued knowledge is in danger of being forgotten by the public.

Please understand that I do not belittle folk knowledge, whether it is knowledge of speech, psychology, medicine, history, philosophy, or chemistry. But I am fully convinced that the folk traditions in speech communication seriously threatens the worthwhileness of the academic level of study and training. If a public ever deems that our discipline's function can be satisfactorily handled by folk educational processes without assistance from educational institutions, then speech communication will die. We, like physicians and others, must face the criticism that out instructions and treatments too often appear to be esoteric. Too many people speak well

without ever meeting a speech communication professor, just as many people are born and live to old age without paying a physician a penny or a visit. While most scholars respect the contributions of folk knowledge (at least to the origin of their discipline), the general public does not understand how and to what degree our scholarship feedbacks into their folk knowledge, e.g., How many North Americans could identify Marshall McLuhan, yet I have witnessed teenagers to otcogenarians talk about media in terms which were not common before McLuhan's great popularity. To the general public, it must sometimes appear that they could get along quite well without us. And from what I read and hear from some of my colleagues, I perceive that many of us have an underlying fear that the general public may be correct. To the contrary, I claim that academic study is of great benefit.

What evidence is there that speech communication is viewed as a dispensable commondity in the academic world? I am not aware of any public opinion surveys in either the general public or in the academic community about our perceived worth. But suffice it to observe that not even half of the high schools teach a single speech course (McBath and Burhans, 1976). Our children are fortunate that high school teachers are so crushed by their jobs that one of their favorite pastiming (time-killing, or let the students do the work) methods for teaching is to have their students give oral book reports, demonstrations, class discussions, recitations. Otherwise many students could avoid completely the opportunity to practice their public speaking skills. In many colleges there is no speech communication staff or the staff is so small that speech communication can only play a minor role in the curriculum.

Our sister discipline, literature/writing, has its origin in the same folk experience of oral story telling. While much criticism has been heaped on teachers and methods of teaching people how to read and write, reading

and writing are still viewed as indispensable skills in our culture. And reading (at least throught the elementary grades) and writing are part of nearly every educational program, while speech communication courses are occasionally part of the curriculum. The key distinction between reading/writing skills and speaking/listening skills is that the first pair of skills must (according to current thought) be laboriously taught to be learned, whereas the second pair of skills can be learned without instruction under normal conditions (Williams, 1972; Cazden, 1972). And this is another case were "common sense" is paradoxically correct while being inaccurate. We are correct when we assume that we can learn rules of speech and listening without instruction, but the rub comes when we ask: What do we learn?

An examination of the contributions of sexology offers a curious analogy for describing this paradox. Folk wisdom tells us that we can learn about sex without professional advice. And we can have babies and have loads of fun, too. But suddenly in the twentieth century we have discovered through scientific research and public discussion of observations and corrections of bad sexual information and practices. It seems obvious that reproduction rates and sexual pleasure were at satisfactorily high levels before the sexologist came along. Now it is clear to us that the sexologist has a contribution to make and it is certain that sexology is having an influence on our culture. This analogy shows that we can learn, and thereby improve, our behavior when prior to the exposure to the new information we took our performance for granted.

Scholars in speech communication need to be aware of the content of folk knowledge and practice. When we are informed about the current state of folk speech, we need to be open-minded in analyzing the folk principles, rules, and behavior patterns. We need to accurately determine what gaps

separate this informal level of knowledge from our formal level of knowledge, and to understand the significance of those gaps. We should develop programs which correct the inaccuracies in folk theory, while improving our ideas as we see them absorbed into society. Research and theory-building require a clear perception of everyday speech communication behavior--the way the folks see it.

The purpose of the present study is to test six hypotheses which predict a rleationship between one's education level, sex, prior public speaking experience, prior public speaking training, and attitude toward studying communications, and one's level of knowledge of public speaking principles. A secondary purpose of this presentation is to provide data which can be used in establishing norms of what student believe to be acceptable principles of public speaking.

The Survey Instrument

For the purpose of measuring each subject's level of knowledge of public speaking principles, I developed "An Inventory of Public Speaking Principles." The inventory has five demographic items concerning class standing, sex, prior public speaking experience, prior public speaking training, and attitude toward studying speech communication; and sixty-nine true/false test items adapted from the instructor's handbook of Jeffrey and Peterson's (1976) textbook Speech: A Basic Text. True/False style items were selected in order to provide coverage of a wide range of specific topics in a short period of time. The criteria for selecting the items were: Likely familiarity of concepts to an educated adult, clear issues in item, plausibility, minimal jargon, and representation of a wide range of priniciples of public speaking.

The validity of the inventory must rest on the source of the items and my judgment in selecting the items. See Table III at the end of this

paper for a complete listing of the items. Reliability was judged to be satisfactory (.79 correlation coefficient on a split-half reliability test). Thirty-five of the items were scored correctly true, thirty-four scored correctly false. Yet sixty-three percent of the answers were given as true, thirty-six percent false, and one percent unanswered. This "true" bias did not result in significantly higher socres. Rather than worrying about a possibility that this inventory is biased in favor of the True-sayer, I think it would be more insightful observation to say that the "plausibility" criterion above seems to have worked its effect. That is, the items were seen as plausible as any good item should appear to a naive subject. The plausibility factor should be accepted as an important component of the inventory.

A pre-assessment procedure was designedfor nine different basic speech communication classes at Columbus (Georgia) College. "An Inventory of Public Speaking Principles" was administered to 151 first day students in those classes. The students were told in the written instructions that the Inventory was designed to determine how much knowledge they had about public speaking. They were told that their results would not influence their grades, but each instructor encouraged students to do their best. Classroom atmospheres were calm and quiet during testing.

HYPOTHESES

Six research questions were asked and six corresponding hypotheses stated:

1. Do students come to speech communication classes with accurate and reliable knowledge of public speaking principles? As I have already discussed, there seems to be a folk knowledge of public speaking. The prediction is that the average inventory score for the 69 true-false items will be significantly higher ($p \leq .05$, one tail t-test) than chance (50% of 69 equals 34.5, which is the chance score) than chance.

2. Do upper classmen tend to understand public speaking principles better than their lower classmen, e. g., does a senior tend to know more about speech than freshmen, sophomores, and juniors? We know that upper classmen tend to be better students (Rosenshire, 1971). One might also assume that the corresponding aging and maturing that go with advancing from one class standing to another would support a slight increase in one's learning and knowledge about such a pervasive experience as public speaking. The prediction is that there should be an insignificant positive correlation coefficient ($r < .25$) between advanced class standing and knowledge of public speaking principles.

3. Do females tend to be more knowledgeable about public speaking principles than males? There is good research available to indicate that females are verbally superior to males, and further research which indicates that female college students have higher grade point aveages (Marlowe, 1971). While research clearly suggest that sex would be a consistent predictor of verbal performance, I predict an insignificant correlation coefficient ($r < .25$) between being female and knowledge of public speaking principles.

4. Does one's experience giving public speeches increase one's knowledge of public speaking principles? The folk tradition is built on the assumption that experience is the best teacher. Experience may be a good teacher in most cases, but it is not always best. Furthermore, knowledge of public speaking principles might be learned just as well by observation as by experience. Public speaking would seem to be one of those activities which because of its complexities would be difficult for a person to master without good instruction. I predict an insignificant positive correlation coefficient ($r < .25$) between the amount of public speaking experience and knowledge of public speaking principles.

5. Does a previous course in public speaking increase one's knowledge of public speaking principles? As I have already discussed in the introduction, I believe instruction is a key to effective communication. I predict that there is a significant positive correlation ($r \geq .33$) between one having had a course in public speaking and knowledge of public speaking principles.

6. Does one's attitude towards studying speech communication reflect a higher or lower level of knowledge about public speaking principles? There is good evidence to support the idea that students learn more when they have a favorable attitude toward the subject (Rosenshire, 1971). Some of the same research demonstrates a doubtful relationship between one's current willingness to study a subject and one's current level of knowledge of that subject. One could effectively argue that the more knowledgeable individuals would tend to be more favorable to expanding their knowledge, while the others would tend to fear the unknown. But explaining these crossed motives is more complex than might be expected. I predict that there is an insignificant positive correlation coefficient ($r < .25$) between attitude towards studying speech communication and knowledge of public speaking principles.

Before turning to a discussion of the results, I will comment briefly on my significance criteria for hypotheses two through six. I am one of those researchers whose goal it is to account for variance (r^2). Statistical probability and test of significance are helpful from time to time in research --as you read in hypothesis number one, I find such a standard useful in testing a hypothesis which is worded in terms of chance. One should when possible attempt to estimate what level of variance needs to be accounted for before he can accept a hypothesis as being practically significant. For the purposes of this research project I decide that a correlation coefficient would need to be $\pm$ .33 (or, r^2 = .10) before the hypothesis could be determined significant; anything with a coefficient below $\pm$ .25 it was decided would be treated as insignificant (and several of the hypotheses were worded to expect insignificance); and, any coefficient between $\pm$ .25 and $\pm$ .33 would be treated as marginally significant. Any coefficient $\pm$ .25 or bigger would with the present sample size meet conventional probability standards.

Table I. Summary of Research Hypotheses

Direction	Prediction	Criterion
Positive statement	S's knowledge of public speaking principles is significantly greater than chance.	$p \leq .05$, one tail t-test
Negative statement	S's class standing (Fr., Soph., Jr., Sr.) is unrelated to level of knowledge of public speaking principles.	$r < .25$
Negative statement	S's sex is unrelated to level of knowledge of public speaking principles.	$r < .25$
Negative statement	S's level of public speaking experience is unrelated to level of knowledge of public speaking principles.	$r < .25$
Positive statement	Having had prior course training in public speaking is positively related to S's level of knowledge of public speaking principles.	$r \geq .33$
Negative statement	S's attitude toward studying speech communication is unrelated to level of knowledge of public speaking principles.	$r < .25$

RESULTS

1. The hypothesis that students would do significantly better than chance on the inventory was accepted. The average score on the inventory was 45.9, 10.4 points above the chance score ($p < .001$). There seems to be strong evidence that these students came to their Speech Communication classes with a significant amount of knowledge about public speaking.

2. The hypothesis that advanced class standing and knowledge of public speaking principles would have an insignificant positive correlation was accepted. The correlation coefficient between class standing and knowledge was .21. Also, in the present sample advanced standing correlated .23 with experience, thus indicating that the higher one's class standing the more probable that he would have had more public speaking experience when compared to his junior classmates.

3. The hypothesis that females would tend to be insignificantly higher in knowledge of public speaking principles than their male counter-parts was accepted. In this sample there was a very slight positive correlation of .03 between being female and level of knowledge. The correlation was so low that we can have no probable assurance from this sample that female are even slightly superior to males on this inventory.

4. The hypothesis that previous public speaking experience has an insignificant positive correlation with knowledge of public speaking is accepted. There was a .10 correlation coefficient between level of experience and level of knowledge, thus indicating that there is a positive direction between increased experience and knowing more about principles. But experience alone does not seem to account for significant variance between people who understand and do not understand public speaking principles.

Table II. Correlation Coefficients of Principles of Public Speaking Score with Class standing, sex, Prior Experience, Prior Training, and Attitude-toward-course.

Hypothesis	Variable	Coefficient (r) with test score
2	Class standing (being Fr., 1; So., 2; Jr., 3; and, Sr., 4)	.21
3	Sex (being female, 1; male, 0)	.03
4	Having had prior public speaking experience	.10
5	Having had prior training	.05
6	Attitude towards studying speech	-.05

5. The hypothesis that having had a previous course in public speaking significantly correlates with level of knowledge is rejected. There was a .05 correlation coefficient between prior training and level of knowledge, thus leaving in question whether these speech students have gained significant knowledge in taking these courses. Apparently, there was little cognitive benefit. There were two items from the inventory which significantly discriminated ($p < .05$, 2 tail t-test) between the trained and the untrained subjects. The untrained subjects were more likely to understand what is "defamatory" (#60) and the trained subjects were more likely to realize that Readers Guide does not contain summaries or digest (#69). Results such as these bring into serious question how much these students learned in high school public speaking courses. This result should be accepted tentatively. There were only 24 students who had previous training. The obvious question is how would all subjects do on a post-test. There was no standard post-test, so such analysis must go unstated.

6. The hypothesis that there is an insignificant positive relationship between attitude towards studying speech communication and current knowledge of public speaking principles is accepted. There was a -.05 correlation coefficient between wanting to take a course in speech and one's level of knowledge. Therefore, we can conclude that attitude might influence learning efficiency, but that in the present sample attitude is an independent function of what the subject already knows. In fact, we are lead to believe that part of the subjects who had a poor knowledge of public speaking realized that they needed to know more, while part of the subjects who had a good knowledge of public speaking realized that they did not have as much to gain from further study of public speaking.

DISCUSSION

The questions examined in this paper focused on resolving the problem of a natural conflict between folk speech theory and academic speech theory. Public speaking principles were selected for analysis because there is an obvious tradition of public speaking in our culture, and hence the likely presence of a well-established folk speech theory. There is a body of knowledge common to public speaking classes which I refer to as academic speech theory. The Inventory of Public Speaking Principles which was developed during this project was constructed in order to measure subject's knowledge of public speaking principles. Because public speaking is an significant function within our culture and its long history, public speaking seemed to offer a fertile field for studying the interaction of folk speech theory (knowledge gained informally) and academic speech theory (knowledge gained formally). Other areas of study, e. g., interpersonal communication, organizational communication, and intercultural communication, offer their own special opportunities to compare and contrast the interaction of folk theory with academic theories. Each of

these special areas of study face the same confrontation with the folk tradition that academic public speaking instruction faces.

The results were clear and in most cases consistent with the prior analysis. Hypothesis$_1$: The subjects in this study have more than chance level of knowledge of public speaking principles. The level of knowledge evidence in this population is not so high as to endanger the need for further instruction. Content analysis reveals unacceptable rates of error on many items (See Table III). But students in this sample came to their classes with a satisfactory level of knowledge for the learning experiences planned. The need to re-educate the students on some issues (see items #2, #4, #7, #32, #43, and #49, for example) is mandated. Obviously, some misconceptions are widely believed. We need to accurately understand which misconceptions are common.

Hypothesis$_2$: Class standing was unrelated to knowledge of public speaking principles. These was statistical significance between these two variables ($r = .21$, p .01, one tail t-test), but the correlation coefficient falls short of even a marginally practical level of correspondence.

Hypothesis$_3$: Females do not seem to know correctly more about public speaking principles than males. It may be that this inventory's emphasis on principles ("rules") is significantly different from verbal aptitude which females typically score higher than males.

Hypothesis$_4$: Previous experience with public speaking was not related to what these subject knew about public speaking principles. Actual experience in public speaking was not thought to give those subjects better insight than subjects who only had observational experience.

Hypothesis$_5$: Previous course experience in public speaking was not related to what people know about public speaking principles. This finding was contrary to the prediction for this hypothesis. As already pointed out only 24 out of the 151 subjects indicated that they had taken a previous course

in public speaking and 19 others apparently had some training in public speaking. A pre-test post-test design hopefully would show that students did correct most of their misunderstandings. The present design raises serious questions about the value and effectiveness of the education and training that the 24 subjects had received. Of course, a more sensitive measurement of "prior speech training" might yield higher coefficients. I am not comfortable rejecting the original hypothesis, but in the present sample the evidence is quite clear that the original hypothesis fails.

Hypothesis$_6$: Favorable attitude toward studying speech communication seemed to be unrelated to a subject's level of knowledge of public speaking.

After reviewing the above findings, I will re-evaluate two assumptions stated earlier. First, that there is a folk speech theory, and second, that there is a traditional academic speech theory. As to the assumption of a folk speech theory, hypothesis number one results give clear support to that idea. There is evidence that these students came to speech classes with prior and accurate knowledge of public speaking principles, most without the benefit of prior formal training or experience. As for the assumption about an academic speech theory, the rejection of hypothesis number five brings that assumption into question. There was little evidence that the subjects with prior training and/or experience had superior knowledge to the untrained and inexperienced. But the second assumption is not clearly tested in this study.

We need to know what the public thinks to be principles of effective communication. We should work towards an open-minded consensus on those points on which agreement can be achieved within our discipline. And even when the academic community learns of points of disagreement between its members or between itself and the folk public, these points of disagreement need to be used constructively to understand how they affect people's communication behavior.

I am convinced that one of the best ways to learn about speech behavior is to ask people about their beliefs, opinions, and attitudes. I think we learn something about public speaking when we realize that maybe 62% of college students realize that "emotional appeals" are an acceptable part of persuasive speaking (#8). But when you realize that 38% of these students believe that it is not acceptable, then we begin to understand some of the irrational, cynical criticism which builds up against a public speaker and public speaking in general. The question remains: What percentage of the American population believe that the use of emotional appeal is acceptable in persuasive speaking? And so the questions go. I recommend an analysis of the the distribution of answers in Table III.

I question whether public speaking textbooks should be limited to an exposition of academic (the author's)standards of public speaking. Perhaps in future textbooks our students will be learning what the general public thinks is effective public speaking as well as learning academic public speaking theory. Surely our students' speeches should be graded according to the academic standards, but do not these students have a responsibility to understand what is the folk theory of speech. My argument is that both the students and teachers of speech should study both folk and academic theory. I am inclined to think that improved, precise knowledge of folk theory will aid the scholar in better stating and explicating his theory. We have known for some time that speech teachers are not magicians, nor are they teaching people a "knack of cooking." But to examine our current knowledge and instruction of speech might bring such a conclusion into question. Too many people are comfortable in ignoring the obvious folk theory, so that they can teach their handy formulas and decant their magic. This criticism does not rest with just public speaking teachers; teachers of interpersonal, organizational, and cross-cultural communication have already established similar patterns of instruction.

If teachers and researchers are to understand the questions and answers that are raised in these inventory items, we need to undertake from time to time systematic searches of our population's beliefs, attitudes, and theories in order to determine what they know and understand. And clearly these searches need to go beyond pre-assessment of the knowledge of public speaking principles. It should be understood that there is a need for designing survey instruments appropriate for collecting data about other areas of knowledge in our field. By undertaking such general and systematic analyses, communication theoretists can gain a more accurate perception of communication norms.

This type of research effort needs to be conducted by teams of researchers made up of individuals from different educational institutions, business organizations, and government agencies. Research projects like the present one are of limited value unless they are conducted with standard survey items. This is not to suggest that such research should be conducted as a monolithic project. Divergent approaches too frequently provide new and insightful observations. But there is a need to generate data which has comparison and contrast potential. For my part I am ready to work with researchers to design survey instruments and to gather the data. Such descriptive data could help estatlish communication norms for speech attitude, knowledge, and behavior. One only has to look at the use of systematic national polling data of Gallop and Harris and the use of this research by political scientist, sociologist, social psychologists, and journalists to understand the benefit of having systematic survey data directly relevant to your field of study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bruning, James L. and Kintz, B. L. (1968). Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.

Cazden, Courtney B. (1972). Child Language and Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Jeffrey, Robert C. and Peterson, Owen (1976). Speech: A Basic Text. New York: Harper and Row.

Marlow, Leigh (1971). Social Psychology: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Human Behavior. Boston: Holbrook.

McBath, James H. and David T. Burhans. Communication Education for Careers. Fall Church, Virginia: Speech Communication Association.

Rosenshire, B. (1971). "Teaching behaviors related to pupil achievement: A Review of research." In Westbury, I. and Bellack, A. A. (Eds.). Research into Classroom Process. New York: Teachers College Press.

Spectra. December, 1973

Williams, Frederick. (1972). Language and Speech. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

		True	False	No answer
(7)	"She bought some new glasses," is an example of a statement that is vague.	126	24*	1
(8)	The use of emotional appeals in a speech to convince or to persuade is generally deplored by speech critics.	57	94*	0
(9)	Wherever possible speakers should avoid the use of statistics becuase audiences often find them difficult to grasp.	68	83*	0
(10)	The most common reason why speakers use words incorrectly is that they don't fully understand their subjects.	92*	58	1
(11)	Expert speakers prefer concrete to abstract language in speeches because abstract language tends to evoke different meanings and images in the minds of the audience.	126*	24	1
(12)	A large audience may require the speaker to use more expansive gestures and to give greater attention to eye contact than would be necessary with a smaller group	76*	74	1
(13)	An advantage of the manuscript method of delivery is that it does not require rehearsal or practice.	40	109*	2
(14)	Speech content consists of <u>what</u> the speaker has to say, while delivery refers to <u>how</u> he says it.	144*	7	0
(15)	A sound technique for a persuasive speaker confronting a hostile audience is to exhibit his confidence with a defiant attitude.	57	92*	2
(16)	Action is often the result of emotional excitement.	140*	10	1
(17)	The use of ghost writers has no effect on the speaker's credibility.	62	87*	2
(18)	The president of the United States or of a large organization obtains positive source credibility as a speaker simply because of the position he holds.	99*	51	1
(19)	In an informative speech, supporting material is seldom necessary if the audience already knows a great deal about the subject.	53	97*	1
(20)	Specific supporting material is usually more interesting than abstract material.	122*	29	0

		True	False	No answer
(21)	It is considered unethical and misleading for a speaker to round off statistics.	53	97*	1
(22)	Comparison is particularly useful in explaining an unfamiliar concept by showing its resemblance to something better known.	145*	6	0
(23)	A speech in which a ship is explained from top to bottom and from bow to stern would be arranged according to spatial or geographical order.	119*	31	1
(24)	In a chronological or time arrangent of materials, the events should be presented in the order in which they occur.	144	6*	1
(25)	"A third important factor is . . .," is an example of signpost.	95*	51	5
(26)	If a speaker's subject logically divided itself into nine or ten points, the speaker should regroup the points into a small number of larger units.	101 *	48	2
(27)	Learning about the theories and principles of effective speech seldom helps to reduce stage fright.	65	85*	1
(28)	Good listeners do not hesitate to say to themselves, "I don't understand that" and "What does that prove?"	126*	23	2
(29)	If he is bored, a listener should overtly demonstrate his disinterest by yawning, whispering to friends, or by reading a book or newspaper.	11	139*	1
(30)	It is unethical for a speaker to resort to emotional appeals to arouse his audience.	34	116*	1
(31)	In addition to being interested in their speech subjects, speakers should regard their topics as significant.	138*	12	1
(32)	In taking an inventory of his interests, the speaker should exclude subjects upon which he has not done extensive research.	80	69*	2
(33)	A common reason why some speakers have difficulty locating speech topics is that they do not know themselves.	114*	36	1

*This response was scored correct.

		True	False	No answer
(34)	The speaker will find advance knowledge of the occasion important only if the speech is to be a part of a special observance such as Founders Day, the Presentation of Awards, or the celebration of some holiday.	36	113*	2
(35)	The preparation of effective speech for a captive audience is easier than planning one for a voluntary audience, because the speaker knows the captive audience cannot leave.	39	112*	0
(36)	The fact that many audiences have preconceived expectations about a speaker may require the speaker to alter or adapt his remarks to fulfill these expectations.	97*	53	1
(37)	One reason for the speaker analyzing the occupational status of his audience is that their vocations may indicate their level of knowledge and education.	137*	14	0
(38)	We have learned that informal language usage is never appropriate in a public speech.	31	120*	0
(39)	We recommend that speakers employ such expressions as "as the crow flies" and "pretty as a picture," because they are familiar and evoke vivid images in the minds of listeners.	38	112*	1
(40)	We have learned that the most important reason why a speaker should use correct language is that a grammatical error may distract the audience.	107*	43	1
(41)	Derogatory language consists of words having an unpleasant or degrading connotation.	119*	30	2
(42)	The superiority misconception refers to the belief that standard English is better than nonstandard English.	97*	50	4
(43)	Audiences usually are conscious of the speaker's vocal techniques if his vocal presentation is effective.	109	41*	1
(44)	An effective speech delivery is important because it may lead the audience to overlook weaknesses in the speaker's content.	122	27*	2
(45)	In the preparation of a visual aid, the speaker should make certain that it is sufficiently detailed to be self-explanatory.	106	45*	0
(46)	Too much movement by a speaker can distract an audience.	134*	16	1

		True	False	No answer
(47)	The courts have ruled that advocacy of forcible overthrow of the government is punishable only if the speaker intended to produce imminent lawless action and that violence was likely to occur as a result of the speech.	110*	36	5
(48)	Regardless of his topic, it is essential that the speaker know the political affiliations of his audience if he is to make the most effective presentation possible.	61	89*	1
(49)	A joke or humorous story is always a good way to get the audience interested in your subject.	120	29*	2
(50)	Publications of special interest groups such as the National Rifle Association, the Urban League, the Sierra Club, and the League of Women Voters are of little value to the speaker in studying a topic because they are usually biased and inaccurate.	25	125*	1
(51)	The World Almanac is a source of general information.	133*	18	0
(52)	The speaker who exhausts his knowledge of a subject in a time given to him to speak has done an inadequate job of preparation.	92*	58	1
(53)	In determining whether his subject is appropriate to the occasion, the speaker should consider the time and place of the speech and the audienc's reason for assembling.	143*	6	2
(54)	Under no circumstances should a speaker discuss highly technical subjects with an audience who has only a high school education.	87	63*	1
(55)	At times, a speaker may be forced to reject a potential speech topic because his audience lacks the knowledge and background necessary to its understanding.	137*	14	0
(56)	If the audience is not interested in the subject before the speech, the speaker does not have a topic appropriate to his listeners.	58	91*	2

*This response was scored correct.

		True	False	No answer
(57)	The speaker should seek to learn about the dominant religious beliefs of his audience, because if he had planned to say anything that might contradict these beliefs, he would want to delete such passages from his speech.	73	76*	2
(58)	Hidden goals--the withholding of one's true motives--are unethical, because the listener has a right to know the speaker's objectives.	85	66*	0
(59)	The specific purpose is an explicit statement of exactly what the speaker hopes to accomplish.	132*	18	1
(60)	For a statement to be defamatory, it must be communicated to a third person as well as be injurious to the subject's reputation.	104*	44	3
(61)	The speaker cannot say that his job of speech preparation has been completed until he has read everything pertinent written on the subject.	47	102*	2
(62)	Transitions, signposts, and internal previews are organizational techniques used to achieve a cohesive development of a speech topic.	134*	14	3
(63)	Speakers should avoid the use of examples and illustrations closely related to the audience's experiences and activities, because they often seem commonplace or boring.	16	135*	0
(64)	"Lake Michigan is the largest body of water wholly within the boundaries of the United States," is a statement of fact.	118*	32	1
(65)	While visual aids often make it easier for an audience to grasp an idea, such aids can also be distracting.	123*	23	5
(66)	The basic test of a speaker's choice of language is not that the words may be understood, but that they cannot be misunderstood.	131*	17	3
(67)	Among the factors with which the speaker will be concerned in analyzing the occasion are the length of the meeting and the time of day.	141*	8	2
(68)	In informative speeches, it is almost invariably desirable for the speaker to state his central thought or purpose early in the speech.	128*	21	2

	True	False	No answer
(69) In investigating a speech topic, the Readers Guide to Periodical Literature is useful because it contains summaries or digests of articles appearing in magazines and journals.	126	22*	3

*This response was scored correct.